

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/576,721	SEINO ET AL.	

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
HENG CHAN	1728	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) HENG CHAN.

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Soonwuk Cheong.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 1 June 2011

**Time:** 2pm

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/HENG M CHAN/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 1728

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner proposed claim amendments in a fax including amending the language of claim 1 and the claimed range of LMAB so that it did not include 0%. The Examiner also suggested making the product claims including claim 4 depend on the process claim 1 so that the process limitations would result in structural differences in the product. Applicants accepted amendments to claim 1, but not claim 4..